2203

Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER — PROUDHON

Vol. XI.—No. 25. NEW YORK, N. Y., APRIL 18, 1896. Whole No. 337

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."

JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

Mr. Lloyd's loss by the fire on the premises of his Buffalo publishers was less severe than it was at first supposed to be. The flames, instead of consuming the entire edition of his poems, simply damaged about one hundred copies. Mr. Lloyd's advertisement reappears in this number.

In the "Home Journal" of April 8 appears a poem by Basil Dahl, entitled "To Her I Hate," a companion poem to a former one, "To Her I Love," which appeared in the same journal. The issue of April 15 contains a new poem by J. Wm. Lloyd, entitled "My First Seminole." Those interested can obtain copies of the paper at the rate of five cents each by remitting in stamps to "Home Journal, 231 Broadway, New York City."

American parties reward their managers with fat offices, while in England the rich members of a party put their hands into their own pockets and reward successful organizers at their own expense. Which is the more mischievous method it is difficult to determine. In America Wanamakers become cabinet ministers, and Van Alens are appointed to high diplomatic posts; in England such prostitution of the public interest would be denounced as intolerable. On the other hand, open reward by rich party men of services rendered to the party as a whole would be fiercely denounced in the United States as an assault on popular government. Parties are supposed to have the national welfare in mind, and not the interests of a class, and there is no reason why a few rich men should pay for a party victory. The presumption is that they pay for private benefits, and see in party triumph an assurance of special privileges to themselves.

It is a fact of some significance that a committee of the senate itself has reported favorably a resolution for a constitutional amendment providing for the election of senators by a popular vote. The contempt and disgust of the public must be extreme indeed to move the slow and "dignified" senate to such radical action. But what reason is there to expect a better quality of senators from direct popular elections? Would it be any improvement, if the senate were permanently kept at the level of the house of representatives? Are the people satisfied with the "popular" branch? The house is not as slow as the senate, but slowness is not always a vice or public misfortune. The trouble is not with the mode of election, but with the kind of work entrusted to congress. Intermeddling with industrial relations involves corruption, and there is no prospect of reform as long as industry is not completely taken out of politics.

Dr. Parkhurst says that, if the ten commandments had been jammed through as New York's new liquor law has been, he would take special pleasure in trampling them under foot. In other words, Dr. Parkhurst does not ask whether a law is inherently good or bad, deserving of observance or not, but simply looks at the methods by which its passage was secured. Can orderly and decent proceedings convert an essentially bad proposition into a good law? And is he justified in violating a sound principle merely because somebody uses disgraceful methods in embodying it into law? There are some things in the ten commandments which are not repugnant to reason and justice, and self-respecting men can obey them without regard to the question of procedure. The ten commandments, by the way, were not passed under parliamentary rules by a deliberative body, if my memory is not at fault, and the fireworks and thunder and spectacular effects which accompanied their first publication were rather calculated to terrify the gaping crowd into submission. If Dr. Parkhurst is consistent, it is his duty to violate those injunctions until the Albany legislature reaffirms them after a proper and dignified debate.

Mr. Howells has written some very silly things lately. Not only has he been advocating a government censorship of art and belittling the importance of the stage, but he has actually been suggesting official theatres for the elevation of the drama. He wants the fool congress in Washington, the Tammany or Platt legislatures, and the boodle aldermen to vote appropriations for municipal or national theatres. How any sane man who has the interests of art in view can expect to secure any improvements through the system and methods that are notorious for corruption and inefficiency passes comprehension. Mr. Howells is deploring continually the decadence of the drama; he condemns most plays as vulgar and shallow and false. He welcomes an occasional performance of an Ibsen or Shaw or Sudermann play with great enthusiasm, recognizing in that alone true art and wholesome realism. Now, does Mr. Howells believe for a moment that a congress or a State legislature or a municipal body of worthies would permit the presentation of "A Doll's House," "Ghosts," "An Enemy of the People," "Arms and the Man," "Magda," "Michael and His Lost Angel," or any other modern progressive play? Would "Chimmie Fadden" and the "Prisoner of Zenda"—justly despised by Mr. Howells—be likely to constitute the staple of the official theatre? Would not the aim be to promote sham patriotism, *bourgeois* morality, cheap sentimentality, and religious superstition? Mr. Howells is so infatuated with State Socialism that the most patent and glaring realities escape him. In politics he is an inveterate romanticist.

There is a bill before congress for the appointment of a commission to investigate the labor problem and report on the causes and remedies of existing evils in industrial relations. The labor organizations of the country are said to be insistent on securing the passage of this ridiculous bill. This shows with what little sense labor unions are governed. The labor problem has been discussed since the advent of the new industrial order, and the different schools and theories that have arisen in relation to it are as far from agreement to-day as they ever were. The literature on the subject is enormous. Think what a commission composed of a few workmen, a few capitalists, and a few politicians will be able to do in the matter! After reading everything about State Socialism, Communism, Anarchism, Individualism, Single Tax, Christian Socialism, Coöperation, Profit-Sharing, Atkinsonism, Protectionism, Greenbackism, etc., etc., and after examining hundreds of men, fit and unfit, the commission will report—what? And suppose it reports in favor of one of the contending schools; will it bind any one? The idea is so absurd that one can have little patience with the labor leaders who encourage the ignorant or demagogic inventor of it. If any proof is needed in this simple case, it is found in the recent report of the British royal commission on the relief of agriculture,—a question much less complex than that of labor and capital. The commission has, of course, disagreed. The majority makes one report, the minority another, and individual members, dissenting from both, submit separate reports. In addition, the report of the minority is so vague and indefinite that the few suggestions which can be gathered from it cannot possibly be embodied in legislation. The only thing that is surprising about this is that any one should be surprised at the outcome. The only substantial result of an American commission on labor will be the expenditure of taxpayers' money on junkets, hotel bills, and champagne. Doubtless there will be a trip abroad. How can labor be investigated without a visit to London, Paris, and Berlin?

Liberty.

Issued Fortnightly at Two Dollars a Year; Single Copies, Eight Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 24 Gold Street.
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., APRIL 18, 1896.

"*In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the exciseman, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel.*" — PROUDHON.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Mr. Salter on the Single Tax.

A few weeks ago Mr. Salter read a paper on the Single Tax before the economic section of the Chicago ethical culture society. With a good deal of what he said the Anarchists who were present found themselves in full accord, but to a number of important averments and admissions they were compelled to take exception. Mr. Salter was especially weak in his postulates. He started out by assuming certain things which are by no means settled or self-evident, and by begging the main question entirely on its ethical side.

According to Mr. Salter the Single Tax fully satisfies the requirements of justice. He does not question its ethical soundness at all, but, on the contrary, admits that Single Taxers have ethics in their favor. On what ground does Mr. Salter make this important admission? The reader will scarcely believe it, but it is literally and absolutely true that Mr. Salter advances no argument at all in support of his view. He bases it on a pure assumption. If, he says, you grant "human brotherhood," you are bound to concede the justice of the Single Tax. Since that system is more conducive to equality, and secures a fairer distribution of natural advantages, those who believe in solidarity and mutualism must prefer it to the present system, under which inequality tends to become greater and greater.

It may be asked, in the first place, why "human brotherhood" cannot be invoked by State Socialists and Communists with equal propriety and cogency. There are other inequalities than those arising from differences in the quality and value of land, and a tax upon "rent of ability," for instance, would certainly seem to be one of the demands made by the sense of brotherhood. Yet Mr. Salter does not propose to appropriate the rent of ability. Is it because he feels that not everything enjoined by brotherhood can be enforced by compulsory means? Then why does he propose to appropriate economic rent by forcible means in obedience to the same sense or sentiment?

The fact is that brotherhood is too uncertain a foundation for any reformatory proposal. If it really exists, then how is it that the things declared to be natural to it have not spontaneously been brought about? If it does not exist, but ought to exist, force will not create it. What men will voluntarily do when they actually feel themselves to be brothers, no one knows. They may adopt the principle of the Single Tax; they may go further and establish complete Communism. But the question today is, given certain conditions and certain men with certain sentiments, what may be enforced and what left to the inclinations of the imperfect persons. I do not think Mr. Salter is prepared to affirm that brotherly relations may be enforced; he will probably agree with us in saying that the only thing we are entitled to secure by the use of physical force is justice. The question, therefore, is whether *justice*, and not brotherhood, demands the establishment of the Single Tax.

We have seen, in another connection, that Mr. Salter's conception of justice is not clearly formulated in his writings. If he should accept the Anarchistic definition, he could not consistently advocate the confiscation of economic rent.

Again, Mr. Salter seems to assume that the Single Tax is the only alternative to the present system of land tenure. When he says that brotherhood points to the Single Tax, his real meaning doubtless is that it revolts against monopoly. But there is another alternative,—the occupancy-and-use tenure. That tenure may not completely satisfy "brotherhood," but it satisfies justice,—in our view, at least. Mr. Salter, in discussing the Single Tax, should compare it, not with monopoly, but with a system of occupying ownership under which there is freedom of access to land and freedom from the payment of any tributes to the State or "community" for the use of natural gifts. Mr. Salter is not the only non-Single Taxer who is led to express a qualified approval of the Single Tax through the failure to perceive the solution of occupying ownership. Such popularity as the Single Tax enjoys may be confidently declared to be due entirely to the assumption that the choice is limited to two alternatives. Few would care for the artificial inequality, with regard to natural media, contemplated by the Single Tax, if they realized the meaning and practicability of occupying ownership.

But, though Mr. Salter subscribes to the Single Tax from an ethical point of view, he vigorously combatted the chief economic arguments made for it. He strenuously denied that the Single Tax would abolish poverty or solve the social problem. Indirectly, he admitted, labor would be benefited by it, but he saw no justification whatever for the extravagant claims and expectations of Single Taxers with reference to the effect of the tax on the poorly-paid and unemployed. He pointed out that it was misleading and untrue to pretend that the Single Tax would give land to the landless or insure *free* access to natural opportunities. There would be no "free" land, he said, but *taxed* land, and not simply taxed, but taxed up to the "highest rental value," as the Single Taxers emphatically remind us on every occasion. How labor would be helped by a system under which it would have to pay for land to the State at least as much as it has to pay now to private landlords, Mr. Salter was unable to see. He might have added that, even if the Single Tax involved perfectly free access to land, poverty would not be abolished by it nor the labor problem completely solved; but Mr. Salter did not go beyond enforcing the proposition that taxed land is no remedy for social evils.

There were a number of prominent Chicago Single Taxers in the audience, but, with one exception, they deemed discretion the better part of valor, and carefully refrained from meeting this telling criticism of Mr. Salter. They talked freely about some of his minor objections, but this plain and capital criticism they avoided. The only Single Taxer who attempted to deal with it is my friend, E. O. Brown, the only Chicago Single Taxer who is genuinely individualistic on other questions than land tenure and who never indulges in poppycock. He perceived the force of Mr. Salter's objection, and felt the necessity of meeting it. But what did this able and clear-headed Single Taxer have to say? Why, that Mr. Salter had overlooked the great point that the Single Tax would discourage speculation in land and compel those holding land out of use either to improve it or to abandon it. It is in this way, said Mr. Brown, that labor will be helped.

This, and nothing more. Had there been anything stronger to say, Mr. Brown would have said it. But there was not, and Mr. Brown is not responsible for the lameness of the Single-Tax theory. Let us analyze Mr. Brown's reply. Admit that the Single Tax would discourage speculation in land; how would that solve the labor problem? In some special cases it would be profitable to improve the vacant land, and such improvement would furnish employment to some. But would the demand for labor be great enough to give work and wages to the army of the unemployed, and raise the rate of wages of those who are already employed? No one can advance such a preposterous claim. Wherever it is profitable to improve land, it is generally improved without the compulsion of the Single Tax. The land that is not improved cannot profitably be improved. To tax such land is to throw it upon the market, and, if it is thrown upon the market, labor is debarred from using it by the heavy tax. Can a laborer without capital take the land abandoned by the speculator and earn a livelihood off it after paying the tax? If he cannot, what is the advantage to him of this politically inaccessible land?

Again, admitting, for the sake of the argument, that the vacant land would be improved, or that labor would take it up, would this solve the labor problem? The Single Tax, we have been told, is a panacea, a great and radical remedy, a method of abolishing poverty, idleness, and oppression. Now, according to Mr. Brown, the Single Tax is chiefly a means of doing away with land speculation. Has it ever occurred to him that land speculation can be abolished in a simpler and more direct way,—by refusing to recognize titles to unoccupied and unused land? If Mr. Brown's object is to discourage land speculation, the Anarchistic principle of land tenure ought to satisfy him, especially since under that tenure land would

really be free and accessible to labor, and any benefits that are to be realized from *free* land would be really open. To free vacant land, no tax is needed, while it is certainly absurd to pretend that taxed land is better for labor than free land.

In the third place, the evil of land speculation is confined to new and undeveloped countries, while the Single Tax is proposed as a universal remedy for all peoples, lands, and climes. Now, how would the Single Tax help labor in England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, Italy, and France? There is no land speculation in those countries worth mentioning. If the Single Tax is to solve the poverty problem there, it must do so in some other way than by throwing unused land upon the market. Yet Mr. Brown knows of no other way. Where population is dense and the land fully occupied either by tenants of great landlords or by small owners (peasant proprietors), the Single Tax would not result in any "freeing" of land. Those who pay no rent at all would have to pay rent to the State-landlord, while those who now pay rent to private landlords would have to pay to a new and more irresponsible landlord. Anarchistic tenure would abolish all landlordism and give men free land in the only true sense of the term.

Mr. Brown, it is manifest, has not only failed to meet Mr. Salter's criticism, but he has reduced the Single Tax to a very insignificant affair. Not only can it accomplish very little for labor and the poor, but the little which is claimed for it can be more directly and effectually accomplished by a simpler method. But, if the Single Tax will not solve the social problem, radical reformers have no interest in it. Once discredited as an economic measure of supreme importance, its alleged ethical merits will not save it from neglect and indifference. Not half a dozen of the most ardent Single Taxers, I venture to say, would remain in the movement, if they were convinced that the economic effects of the reform would be very slight. They do indulge in considerable talk about the philosophy, theology, ethics, and metaphysics of the Single Tax, but every sensible man knows that all that is cant and rant. Mr. Salter's admission that the Single Tax is just in the abstract does not compensate them for his denial of its alleged economic blessings. This being so, it is incumbent upon them to dispose of Mr. Salter's criticism. One of their strongest men has attempted it—and failed. V. Y.

The Ways of Single Taxers.

Despite the excessively bad manners of which Comrade Trinkaus convicts the Chicago Single Tax Club in his interesting account, on another page, of its behavior on a recent occasion toward its invited speaker, Mr. Yarros, I find it difficult to assent to his conclusion that the Single Taxers are small game. This may be true of the western Single Taxers, who, to be sure, constitute a majority of the party, and who, in one respect, are so much more logical than their eastern brethren that, unlike them, they do not limit their platform of compulsory Socialism to a Single-Tax plank, but embody in it many of the well-known proposals of the followers of Marx. But of the individualist wing of the Single Taxers—and by this I mean the *extreme* individualist wing, which is best represented by the Philadelphia group, and not the strict disciples of George, who wish to tax dogs and to tax banks and to make the State the owner of all "natural monopolies"—it must be said, I think, in fairness, that the men composing it, apart from their Single-Tax vagary, have a greater knowledge of economic and political science than any other body of social reformers, except the Anarchists, with whom, in fact, still setting aside the vital difference on the land question, they may be said to occupy virtually common ground. Now, this very fact that they attempt to rest so invasive, so Archistic a measure as the Single Tax upon political principles which in the main are Anarchistic and which they ably expound, renders them, instead of the champions of liberty which they sincerely believe themselves to be, rather the most dangerous enemies of liberty, and therefore big game rather than small.

It is to be added, however, that Mr. Trinkaus would be justified in his estimate of their calibre, if no other evidence were to be considered than the ridiculously insignificant arguments with which the members of the Chicago Single Tax Club met Mr. Yarros's criticisms. It is not my purpose to examine them in detail, but, in passing, I may cite as an example the lame attempt to dispose of the criticism, often made by Liberty and repeated by Mr. Yarros at Chicago, that land is not the only thing that is increased in value by the growth of the community, and that unearned increment therefore must be confiscated in all its forms, if in any. To claim a difference between land values and newspaper values on the ground that the latter are "due entirely to the fact that men invest brains and capital in an enterprise that supplies an economic want" is to ignore the fact that the same thing is as true of the former. Neither land opportunities or publication opportunities have the smallest value in any community, no matter how large, which lacks the brains and capital to utilize them. A corner lot suitable for a drug store but wanted only by idiots who desire to put up a druggist's sign and keep no drugs or anything else for sale is as valueless as a newspaper opportunity where there is no one to improve it further than by the issue of a sheet utterly blank except for the title.

It is my belief that, if some of the Philadelphia contingent had been present at the Chicago debate, Mr. Yarros would have had a harder row to hoe. They would have had the keenness, which the Chicago men lacked, to take up his fundamental, and in my judgment fatally false, assertion that all men have equal rights in external natural agencies, and to point out that it is occupancy-and-use tenure, and not the Single Tax, which goes counter to this alleged equality of rights. There would have been a very pretty quarrel, and Mr. Yarros would, in so far, have had the worst of it, although his other criticisms would have remained unanswered and unanswerable.

But all this is scarcely to the purpose of my article or of Mr. Trinkaus's letter. He wrote mainly, I suppose, to show that Chicago Single Taxers do not know how to behave, and he certainly established the fact that they treated Mr. Yarros shabbily. Before the Single Tax Club of Philadelphia Mr. Yarros surely would have fared better, so far as manners are concerned. Even in that city, however, the Single Taxers are a little curious in their ways, as I have reason to know; and I propose to air here, lest I may never have a better opportunity, one or two of my own grievances, as fittingly supplementary to those of Mr. Yarros.

A short time ago Mr. Yarros, in writing to me from Chicago, incidentally mentioned that Mr. E. O. Brown of that city recently returned from a visit to Philadelphia, where he had been informed that Mr. G. F. Stephens and myself had lately debated the land question in Philadelphia, and that "Tucker had put up a very poor fight." I at once replied to Mr. Yarros that I would like permission to publish this statement in Liberty and comment upon it. As a result I received the following letter from Mr. Brown:

My dear Mr. Tucker:

Mr. Yarros has just shown me a letter from you, asking permission to quote in Liberty a paragraph in a letter from him to you in which he repeats a conversation with me, that conversation containing something which you (and perhaps he) spoke of as "the statement of Philadelphians" to me. I should not like to give a permission like this without consulting Mr. G. F. Stephens. He was the only person—Philadelphian or otherwise—with whom I had any conversation on the matter mentioned.

Incidentally, while I was with Mr. Stephens in Philadelphia or Delaware, he said that he had a discussion before the Art Club on the land question, and that he thought your criticism of the Single-Tax position was not a strong one. He proceeded to say that he thought it gratifying that those persons who are the most thoughtful and logical of the opponents of the Single Tax (by which I understood him to mean the Anarchists) could, after all, at their best, make but so weak and unsatisfactory arguments against our doctrines and theories. I agreed with this, and perhaps somewhat foolishly repeated the conversation to Mr. Yarros, in telling him of my eastern trip and my regret that I had not been able to call on you in New York.

I really think that the matter is not worth mention, in Liberty or elsewhere, and I should dislike to authorize any publication without Mr. Stephens's consent. I have sent to him a copy of this letter that I write to you, in order that no misunderstanding may arise, which is a thing I extremely dislike among friends.

Very truly,

EDWARD O. BROWN.

CHICAGO, MARCH 11, 1896.

Later Mr. Yarros informed me by letter that Mr. Stephens had written to Mr. Brown, expressing his willingness to have Mr. Brown's report of his conversation with Mr. Stephens printed in Liberty. It is on the strength of this permission that I now make Mr. Brown's letter public.

It will be seen that there is no material difference between the brief version first given me by Mr. Yarros and that of Mr. Brown. The essential statements are that I have lately debated the land question in Philadelphia with Mr. Stephens, and suffered a defeat. With the second of these statements, considered in itself, I find no fault. Whenever a public debate occurs, the awarding of the laurels is purely a matter of opinion, and, whenever any person, in commenting upon any debate of mine, sees fit to declare his judgment that my opponent was victorious, I willingly accord him the liberty of his opinion, and pass on, consoling myself with the reflection that "there are others." But, when some one declares that I have been whipped in a debate, and declares it knowing

perfectly well that no such debate ever took place, then, despite Mr. Brown's opinion that the "matter is not worth mention," I think it time to enter a remonstrance. That the matter is not worth mention is a thought that might well have occurred to Mr. Stephens and Mr. Brown at an earlier stage of the proceedings.

But Mr. Brown need have no foreboding regarding the possibility of a misunderstanding, if by that term he means quarrel. Mr. Brown is a gentleman whom I hold in very high respect, and for Mr. Stephens, with whom I happen to be more closely acquainted, I feel a deep and genuine love. For years he has been my friend and Liberty's friend; in aid of Liberty he has been most generous; and, besides this special hold which he has taken upon my affections, he has also the same general hold upon them that he has upon those of the hosts of people who know him for one of the sweetest natures and finest fellows in the world. I acquit him in advance of any intention to misrepresent in the matter now at issue, and yet I repeat that, while in possession of all the facts, he has been guilty of misrepresentation.

Of these facts let me now remind him. Within the Philadelphia Art Club there is a smaller club or circle, which, for want of a name, is sometimes called the Nameless Club. This circle holds a monthly dinner in the house of the Art Club, which is followed by a discussion of some topic previously agreed upon,—generally an art topic. Some weeks ago it was determined by the club to divert its attention for a moment to social problems, and the idea was conceived of having a brief presentation, before the club, of the principal solutions of the social question. These solutions having been correctly decided to be three in number,—State Socialism, Single Tax, and Anarchism,—the plan was formed of having three short addresses on the same evening from competent representatives of these schools. But, as no satisfactory champion of State Socialism was available in season, the programme was reduced to two addresses,—one to be delivered by Mr. Stephens on the Single Tax, the other by me on Anarchism. In the invitation which was sent to me I was distinctly and carefully informed that the affair was not to be a debate, that no antagonizing of opposing schools was desired, and that the intent was simply to have a presentation by each speaker of the claims of his own school that the members of the club might have an opportunity for comparison. These conditions were acceptable, and I accepted them. Now, it is one of my peculiarities that, having accepted conditions, I have a strong prejudice in favor of compliance with them,—so strongly that, upon a previous and similar occasion, when I had been invited to make a half-hour speech on Anarchism before a conference of Unitarian ministers, to be followed by two half-hour speeches by Rev. W. D. P. Bliss and President Andrews of Brown University on State Socialism and State regulation respectively, and when I kept within the time limit, while the two other gentlemen spoke an hour each, the chairman, Rev. C. C. Everett of Harvard University, called the attention of the audience to the fact that, of the three speakers, the Anarchist was the only one who had not broken the law.

Likewise at Philadelphia the Anarchist did not break the law to which he had agreed. Mr. Stephens made the first address, which was properly and naturally devoted to the land question, since the Single-Tax solution of the social question involves nothing but the land question. I followed; and quite as properly and naturally my address was devoted in very small measure to the land question, since the Anarchistic solution of the social problem consists in the application of a certain principle to every phase of social life, including land tenure as simply one among these phases. I spoke probably thirty-five or forty minutes. The first fifteen or twenty minutes were devoted to pointing out the popular misconceptions of Anarchism,—that is, to showing what Anarchism is not. Then I proceeded to show what Anarchism is, and especially its relation to the labor problem. I discussed one after another the various economic categories, and the application to them of the Anarchistic principle. The land question was reserved to the last, and received at most three minutes' attention. I acknowledged that the land problem is an extremely perplexing one, and that none of the solutions offered, not even the Anarchistic, is entirely closed to criticism, but claimed that the objections urged against the Anarchistic solution rest solely upon the difficulty of applying it, while those urged against other solutions are successful assaults upon them not only as impracticable or beset with obstacles, but as unsound and unjust in principle. I then stated briefly the occupancy-and-use theory of land tenure, but did not advance any arguments in its favor or attempt to refute any arguments against it, with the exception of a single sentence, in which I said (not in answer to Mr. Stephens, for, if my memory serves, he had not dealt with the point) that there is no force in the claim that enforcement of occupancy-and-use titles involves government and is therefore Archistic, unless there is force in the general claim that all protection of person and property is Archistic, for the Anarchistic defence association would assume no control of land further than to render a jury decision regarding any disputed claim to land, being in that respect not at all like the State of the Single Taxer and the State Socialist, whose function would be, not to decide upon individual grievances, but to either pool or equally distribute rent and (under State Socialism) every other form of usury. This, bear in mind, was simply a three-minute incident in a forty-minute speech which otherwise did not touch the land question.

Then ensued a run of conversation among the club members, which turned mainly on the land question. In this, so far as I remember, I took no part, the main participants being Mr. Thomas Earle White, who urged the theory of occupancy and use, and Mr. Stephens,—the former, in my judgment, not suffering from the collision. After this conversation Mr. Stephens again formally took the floor, and made a speech of greater length than that of his opening,—a speech which I can characterize only as a piece of political stump oratory utterly inappropriate to the occasion. The oratory was fine, I admit. So fine that I myself applauded it as a work of art, though it was plain to me that it was no spontaneous effort, but the result of careful rehearsal and frequent repetition on the Delaware stump. From beginning to end it contained not one word of argument. It was an ethical and emotional appeal for sympathy in behalf of those who are suffering from injustice—in form courteous, but, to my thinking, in substance insulting to a body of men of superior cultivation and intelligence who had just given evidence of their interest in the oppressed by inviting Mr. Stephens to tell them, not that the oppressed needed help, but how they could best be helped. It was, further, a glorification of the Single-Tax campaign in Delaware, in which the speaker proclaimed, with all the fervor of one who has just "experienced religion," that before this campaign he had never known what a glory it is to live, and rather more than intimated that any one, no matter what his reason might tell him as to the economic and political soundness of the Single-Tax theory, who did not give way to his emotions and vote for it, and even go down into Delaware in uniform to beat the bass drum in true Salvation Army style, was recreant to his highest duty. Amid the applause which greeted his peroration, in which, I repeat, I joined, I realized that I should have been filled with admiration, were I not already overflowing with a feeling composed in equal parts of sorrow, pity, and disgust.

As Mr. Stephens, in the course of his second speech, had assumed that the Delaware Single-Tax campaign would be viewed approvingly by Anarchists because its object is to abolish all existing taxes and put but one in their place, and as I had greeted this statement with a "No," when he had finished I took thirty seconds to explain that I view with disfavor every phase of the Single-Tax movement because I consider it the first and a long step in State Socialism, and that therefore I must deplore any success it may achieve, as likely to end in complete State Socialism, which perhaps would be the greatest calamity that ever befell the human race. With this single remark I contented myself, for I was not there to debate with Mr. Stephens, and I felt that to make a second speech would be an abuse of the club's courtesy.

The foregoing is a substantially correct account of the proceedings on the occasion in question, and I challenge Mr. Stephens to impeach it in any important particular. My own part in them may have been of the feeblest, though it was highly praised by members of the club, at least one going so far as to characterize it as "masterly." It is not for me to sit as judge in my own case. Moreover, all those who know me well are perfectly aware that I do not plume myself upon my power as a public speaker, but am, rather, painfully conscious of my deficiency in that line. But, whether, before this Philadelphia club, I acquitted myself in a masterly or puerile fashion, this at least is certain,—that I did not there debate the land question or any other question with Mr. Stephens or with anybody else. So, when he declares to Mr. Brown that I did, and that I "put up a very poor fight," one can infer, knowing him to be a man of perfect honor, only that he has Single Tax so thoroughly on the brain that it has obscured his sense of proportion, causing him to magnify an incidental remark upon the Single Tax into a debate upon the land question, and to forget altogether

the real purpose of the occasion which developed that incident. I have gone to this pains to set the matter right, simply in order that any readers of Liberty who may chance hereafter to hear further boasts of the Philadelphia Single Taxers may know how much reliance to place on them.

Let me add that, though I did not debate the land question with Mr. Stephens before the Philadelphia club, he can be accommodated with such a debate, if he desires one. But it must proceed in print, and in Liberty. Let him begin when he chooses.

When I commenced this article, it was my intention to air a second grievance by exposing a piece of political trickery recently perpetrated by the organ of the Philadelphia Single Taxers, "Justice." But my article has already grown to great proportions, and perhaps it is not worth while. The responsibility for the cheap humbuggery to which I refer I do not place upon Mr. Stephens. But that he finds it the highest glory to live and work with those who delight in descending to such things shows the disastrous effect of politics upon the best of men. T.

At last we have the explicit admission of the "Voice" that free trade in liquor would take the saloon out of politics. It says: "Free trade in liquor and suppression are the only two ways we know of to eliminate the saloon from politics." Of course the claim that prohibition would accomplish the same result as free trade is absurd. Under free trade the liquor dealers have absolutely no motive to go into politics as liquor dealers, while under prohibition the motive is even greater than under partial restriction. Attempts to repeal prohibitory laws would necessarily be made from time to time, and the question would never be regarded as settled. Those who want to sell and those who want to buy would be equally interested in changing the law. The "Voice" goes on to explain why it prefers prohibition to free trade as the method of banishing the saloon from politics: "The trouble with free trade is that it does not also eliminate the liquor from politics, and the liquor does more political harm than the liquor-dealer. Suppression will remove both the liquor-dealer and the liquor from politics." It will do nothing of the sort. Prohibition or no prohibition, people will get liquor to drink. As the quality of the liquor will be poorer under prohibition, its effect on politics will be worse than the effect of good liquor. Liquor can be taken out of politics by a law disfranchising habitual or excessive drinkers, and I suggest to the "Voice" the following platform: (1) free trade in liquor as a means of taking the saloon out of politics; (2) temperance qualification for voters. This would accomplish its object with a minimum of invasion, and would not interfere with the freedom of those who do not care anything about politics.

President Cleveland, whose sexual morality has not, of late, been questioned by his worst enemies, has authorized the issue of an order forbidding any Indian on a reservation to have more than one wife. The essential unfairness of this ukase is pointed out even by that "home paper," the New York "Recorder," whose strict fidelity to monogamy is above suspicion. Says the "Recorder": "This is a provision not contained in any one of the compacts with the red men under which supplies are distributed by Uncle Sam,—a provision that would not have been accepted by the aborigines as a feature of any of those compacts,—and virtually constitutes the use of force to change an agreement against the will of one of the contracting parties. For it must not be forgotten that these Indians are not recipients of charity, but have handed over lands worth ten times the sum on which the interest is represented by the annual value of supplies distributed."

At last, we are told, the interstate commerce law is in a fair way of becoming a terror to evil-doers. The decision of the federal supreme court upholding the right to compel answers to questions put to railroad men with the view of laying bare the infractions of the law is believed to have imparted life and vigor to the statute which has been worse than a dead letter. Well, we shall see. If the railroads do not find a way to evade the law as successfully as they have done hitherto, there will be occasion for disappointment. American intelligence ought to be equal to the emergency. Meanwhile it is important to treasure up the frank confession of the entire press that the country has been paying high salaries to a lot of politicians without getting anything in return. This is government's way of doing business. Verily, the "social organism." which, Mr. Salter asserts, can do anything it chooses, is very clumsy and inefficient.

"The Congress" is in favor of every rebellion except a rebellion against the United States government, and, possibly, a rebellion against that great "natural ally" and friend of the United States, Russia.

Upon Mr. Labadie's article in the present issue I may comment in the next.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, STEPHEN T. BYINGTON, Flushing Institute, Flushing, N. Y.

Why I believe in the Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps:

Second reason—because this gives everybody an opportunity to become a worker for the cause. If you are afraid of losing your place or your social standing by talking Anarchism to your neighbors, you can speak out freely in newspaper letters without fear of being identified by any acquaintance. If you feel that you have not the ability to make your letters impressive, by sending them at the same time with a number of others you can compel attention. Even if you are unable to give a clear statement of what you believe and why you believe,—though every Anarchist should be able to do this at least,—your letter may yet serve to draw more attention to those of others who write better.

But I do not believe there are many of us who cannot put valuable ideas into our letters, and make people of ordinary intelligence understand more or less of these ideas. The worst cripples among us in this respect are those who cannot express themselves on paper without using a lot of long and uncommon words, of which "invasive" is the most troublesome. Such cannot expect to be entirely understood except by those who are already familiar enough with the subject to have learned this language; but even they can put a good many new ideas into the average reader's head.

The most important work of the Corps, perhaps, is to correct false ideas about the meaning of Anarchism. To do this it is necessary only to be able to see what mistake somebody has made in talking of Anarchism, and tell what that mistake is. Surely this is not too hard for anybody. It is not even necessary to see and correct all the mistakes; if you straighten out one or two, your work is well worth doing. And, when the Corps has work other than the correction of mistakes, it is still not necessary to be able to argue for our cause. Just tell what we mean to do, or part of what we mean to do, and your work may turn out to be better than argument; for it will help make people see what Anarchism means, and that is what we want. If the Corps only had fifty new members who would do just this and no more, how we could make things hum!

A criticism of W. B.'s letter reproduced below. He argues for Anarchism without explaining at all what it means. Then, as of course the editor and average reader don't know beforehand what Anarchism is, the letter is necessarily nonsense to them; or, rather, as they have a false idea of Anarchism, the letter will make false sense in their minds.

Target, section A.—"Saturday Argus," Clinton, Ind., a paper of Single Tax and Populist tendencies; editor said to need clearing up as to what Anarchy is. Show why Anarchy is what the people need.

Section B.—"The Farmers' Voice," 334 Dearborn street, Chicago, Ill., published the following letter and reply on March 28:

AN ADVOCATE OF ANARCHY.—The faith of many good people in patent medicines is something wonderful. Whether the health remains *statu quo* or is getting worse, nothing disturbs their faith. Here we have now for over a century taken the patent medicine of yours, the ballot; after every dose we are a little worse off than before, and yet you say (date February 1) that, "unless the people assert their power at the ballot-box, we shall be still worse." Have you no suspicion that there might be a mistake in the medicine, when the loudest advocates of it are the boodlers and the office-seekers? And then to hear decent people like "The Farmers' Voice" join the chorus! It is very discouraging. You will probably say that, if we stayed away from the ballot-box, all of us, we should have Anarchy. Just so; that's what the boodlers are afraid of. Are you?—W. B.

—No, sir, we are not afraid of Anarchy. Any Anarchist that raises his head in civilized society will have it shot off his shoulders, and ought to have it shot off. We have a system of government, in which the majority can rule, if it is willing to make the sacrifices to rule. This correspondent is one of the windbags of progress. He is not a subscriber to "The Farmers' Voice" or any other decently conducted paper, we will guarantee. This paper believes in the American system. It believes in the ballot-box; and, if the human race cannot maintain its liberties and its rights, under our system of government, it cannot maintain them with the pistol, dynamite, or the bludgeon. It makes us tired to hear the vaporings of a man like this. He had better go shoot himself, and enter the companionship of angels, if he can get there. He is too good or too bad for association in a community in which the majority can rule if it wishes to. No Anarchy for us. We have too much at stake—in family and hope—to think of such a thing for a moment.

Get this editor to see that Anarchists are the most uncompromising opponents of the "pistol, dynamite, and bludgeon" policy which he himself in his second sentence savagely supports. Give him miscellaneous information, as much as a short letter will hold, about the meaning of Anarchism, but emphasize especially the points that Anarchism is opposition to violence, and its enemies are supporters of violence.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

It Moves the World.

[Translated by Stephen T. Byington.]

To the child who complainingly cries,
"Give me bread, give me bread, give me bread!"
The earth in its quaking replies;
The volcano, in lava-streams red.

Unknown Spanish Author.

Sestina of the Red Heart and White World.

My songs have breathed the music oft of love,
And oft intoned a lyric for the free,
And often chanted Nature and her charm;
But now I sing the Red Heart's purpose great,
And sing the White World that this shall become
When men count manhood more than things that serve.

When men count manhood more than things that serve,
We shall not need, I trow, to speak of love;
For, certes, to fit souls sweet love shall come
In Nature's course, when first the way is free,
But most of all to those whose thoughts are great,
And least to jealous ones who prison charm.

Monopoly of land and love and charm,
And lust of power unpaid to make men serve,—
These are the things which are not truly great,
And yet this Dark World yields them all its love,
And mocks at those who prophesy the free,
And says, 'neath heaven, the White things cannot come.

Yet, when the Red Heart beats, shall surely come
The White World with its peace and health and charm,
Its comrades working side by side, yet free,
Each other serving, yet unforced to serve;
Its daily life a garden wherein love
Blooms large, and each man's genius ripens great.

When each man's selfhood grows to ripeness great,
Root-based in Nature, whence all ripe things come,
Its bud and fruiting age the genius-love
Of perfect skill in dainty feats that charm
And true success in sterner works that serve,—
Art shall be all delightful, being free.

I see my song return to all things free,
It finds no other theme so truly great;
Nature alone, in freedom, may I serve;
It shall be so with all when White days come,
Wherein no deed of mastership may charm,
Nor coldness check the Red Heart's crimson love.

Comrades, be free! and then the White shall come,
Life's commonplace grow great and rich in charm,
And all hearts Red to serve with human love.

J. Wm. Lloyd.

Single Tax Club Manners.

Dear friend Tucker:

Thinking that it may be of interest, I write you the details of a meeting that took place in Orpheus Hall in the Schiller Building, Chicago, on March 20. Our friend, Mr. Yarros, was billed to speak before the Single Tax Club on that occasion, his subject being "Some Criticisms of the Single Tax." I attended with the hope of amusement as well as instruction, and my expectations were fully realized. The Single Tax Club has the reputation (principally among its members) of being in possession of the whole of economic truth, and, being a truth-hunter, I was anxious for a test of its wisdom. It also has the reputation (principally among outsiders) of being intolerant and discourteous to all those who do not swallow its medicine. This latter reputation it sustained wonderfully well on this occasion. The lack of civility was so pronounced that two or three of the members themselves protested against the others' ill behavior. Of course this will react on all intelligent sympathizers. Egotism and incivility are qualities that can make no headway in a cause that requires the good-will of intelligent and fair-minded men and women.

Those who were willing to listen with open minds enjoyed a treat that evening. The speaker opened by saying that he repudiated the notion so generally held by the Single Taxers that the labor movement is a religious movement. The labor movement is an attempt to adjust disjointed economic institutions along lines of justice, and it will reach a proper and speedy solution in proportion as the religious element is entirely separated from it.

In order to narrow the criticism so as to be within proper range of his game, the speaker divided the Single Taxers into two classes,—*viz.*, State Socialists and Individualists. Those who defend all manner of State intervention, including the gathering of rent, he classed as State Socialists, and those who limit the functions of the State to defence plus the gathering of rent he classed as Individualists. He then set aside the State Socialists, and directed his attention exclusively to the Individualists.

He examined the biological warrant for the use of land, and found that life can be sustained only by organisms assimilating objects from the external world. Land being the economic term for all the external natural agencies, it follows that man cannot be divorced from it without peril to his existence. In addition, the fact of aggregated life makes it incumbent upon us to seek an ethical basis for the use of land. Scientific ethics teaches us that all men have equality of rights in satisfying their biological needs. Equality of rights to satisfy the requirements of life is, therefore, the highest conception of land relations.

The Single-Tax doctrine, he said, violates the scientific conception of proper land relations when it contends for an equalization of differences of advantage that may be enjoyed by some over others. It is the injection of an essentially communistic principle, and in conflict with the genuine necessities of the case. Besides, to a mind guided by facts and logic, there arises the question whether there is not "unearned increment" in other parts of the industrial domain. Common observation shows that many industrial enterprises owe much of their value to the existence of the community in the same sense that land values do. For instance, a newspaper plant is established in a growing community. Every increment of population and business redounds to the advantage of it without any effort on the part of those who are interested in it. These instances can be multiplied at will. If the Single Taxers were true to their doctrine of "unearned increment," much value arising from other sources than land would come under the ban of the tax-gatherer.

But, he continued, assuming that the foundation of the George doctrine is correct, in what way would it help the farmer? Mr. Shearman, who is a recognized representative of that school, argues that there would be practically no difference in the amount of taxes that the farmer would be compelled to pay in rent under the Single Tax *régime* and the amount that he now pays in taxes in various ways. If this be true, then how is it possible for the agricultural element to be benefited by any such change?

This query is equally applicable in the case of the city laborer. It must be borne in mind that we are living in an industrial age that requires more than labor and land to produce wealth. Capital is an indispensable element in the proceedings, and, without it, man can do nothing. It is mockery to say to men that they may have access to land on the condition of paying rent, when it requires capital to put it to effective use. Men can use land now under at least as favorable conditions. There are vast amounts of land in the United States that can be had for the mere asking. Men do not take it, because they would be incapable of producing the kind or quantity of utilities that modern industry requires.

The incompetence of the Single Taxers as economists, he continued, is clearly shown in the fact that they confound economic with monopolistic rent. There is a rent that arises from the fact that more can be produced on some portions of land with a given application of capital and labor than other portions of land with the same amount of capital and labor. But, besides this, there is also a rent that arises because a class of men are able, through legal methods, to possess more land than they are using. This gives them the power to absorb wealth they have no proper title to, and all this is monopolistic rent. It is plain that these two manifestations of rent are distinct and separate, and, since the Single Taxers do not distinguish between them, they are led to extraordinary and erroneous remedial conclusions.

The object of the Single Tax, he said, is to make land free. This is its real purpose, the fiscal measure being merely a means to an end. But does this not appear as an extremely artificial procedure? If free land be the desideratum of the land reformers, and their demands are satisfied when men have equal freedom to satisfy life's needs, the simple, natural, and direct way to its realization is to destroy that which gives men privilege to possess land not occupied and used.

Another mistake of the Single Taxers, he said, is their assumption that the land problem is the whole of the industrial problem. They entirely ignore the fact that a large part of unjust distribution is brought about by causes entirely separate and distinct from the influence of land monopoly. Credit monopoly, patent and copyright monopolies, and many others are equally responsible for the impoverishment of the workingmen. The solution of the labor problem necessitates the storming of the entire citadel of monopoly.

The speaker also took exception to the George contention that rent absorbs all the advantages of material progress. This, he said, is denied by the income tax returns of Great Britain, which shows that industrial profits increase at least in as great a ratio as the rents of land.

The most important objection to the scheme of the Single Tax, he maintained, is that it fosters governmentalism and opens the way for its enlargement. If the vast revenue which is now going into the treasury of the landlords should go into the coffers of the State, it is contended that the people will be supplied with free schools, free illumination, free transportation, and what not. But this is by no means a progressive tendency. Those who know that progress takes place most where freedom of experiment and comparison is greatest look with repugnance on any scheme which ends in the subservience of the people to governmental absolutism.

During the meeting the speaker was interrupted by a Mr. Cooling, one of the stars of the Single-Tax aggregation, who wanted the speaker to conclude early so as to give the members of the club an opportunity to criticise the lecture. He said that it was usual to stop at a given time, and he insisted that the practice be complied with. As a matter of fact, however, the "usual time" was no particular hour, as practice proved that it ranged widely. To an outsider, this attempt to shorten the proceedings seemed like a scheme to prevent the speaker from saying all he had to say. The visitors present, together with some of the members, protested against this, and it was voted to give Mr. Yarros all the time he wished.

When the time arrived to criticise the lecturer, I expected to see all of the economists on their feet at once. But, instead, a profound and prolonged silence ensued. Finally they seemed to gain their bearings, and began to attack the speaker's remarks. The principal criticisms may be summarized as follows:

(1) The speaker's contention that "unearned increment" arises from other sources than advantages in land does not evince a very clear understanding of the nature of the phenomenon. That newspapers increase in value in a growing community no one denies; but the value is due entirely to the fact that men invest brains and capital in an enterprise that supplies an economic want. To prove that the value of a newspaper is due to such forces only, let any one attempt to issue a blank sheet with nothing but the name of a newspaper at its head, and he will immediately understand that there is no similarity between land and newspaper values.

(2) Contrary to the remarks of the speaker, it is the contention of the Single-Tax doctrine that industrial profits increase hand in hand with the increase of rent. The income-tax returns of Great Britain, therefore, bear out the exact contention of that school. (This was said in face of the fact that Henry George has several chapters in his "Progress and Poverty," attempting to prove that all material progress redounds to the advantage of rent, and rent alone. Besides, only a few weeks ago, Prof. Loomis, a member of the Chicago Single-Tax Club, read an article before his Club on "The Evolution of the Shoe Industry," which tried to prove that rent absorbed all the economies evolving from that business.)

(3) The views of the speaker (which are representative of what is known as philosophical Anarchism) are too abstract; they do not fit the requirements of concrete conditions. He does not appreciate the fact that there can be no aggregated industrial intercourse unless there is a consensus of action on the part of such aggregation, and this can be brought into execution only through some sovereign power representing them through the majority principle.

(4) In the absence of a regulated land system like that ensuing from the Single Tax, there is no principle to determine whether a man is using land to the best interests of the society of which he is a part. Where there is mere occupancy and use, there is nothing to hinder him from using for agricultural purposes land that is best adapted for commercial purposes; and, were he so to use it, the proper economy and order that is so necessary in our industry would not be practised.

(5) It is quite evident that the speaker does not fully grasp the import of the idea of economic rent. Economic rent includes all of that wealth which is absorbed by men who have advantageous natural agencies at their command. This includes not only superior agricultural land, but every superior commercial point, whether of water power, dockage, transportation and illumination facilities, etc. The Ricardian theory was originally an agricultural theory, but economists have since developed it, so that to-day it is applied to all natural advantages outside of man.

When the speaker of the evening arose to answer his critics, there was a feeling in the audience that a foe worthy of Single-Tax steel had been among them. He told them that he had heard that the Chicago Single Tax Club was noted for intolerance and incivility, and that it sustained its reputation on that evening. He then ran over the principal points that he had dwelt on in his lecture to show that the general discussion was not to the point. As he was about to take up the real points that were made, a considerable number of persons left the hall, and Mr. Yarros desisted from further talk. I am sorry that he was prevented from answering the points made, for I am certain that he would have done them justice.

I think it can be safely said that earnest students have learned one thing as a result of this meeting,—namely, that Single Taxers are small game.

Yours sincerely,

WM. TRINKAUS.

The Meaning of Anarchy.

This is a good time, it seems, to enter a protest. You have heard, no doubt, the expression of being killed by kindness. Well, I am not exactly being killed by kindness, but am being put in a false light by friends and foes alike. J. T. Small of Provincetown, Mass., says I am "one of the ablest exponents" of Anarchism; Professor Raymond, of Detroit, calls me "one of the most intelligent philosophical Anarchists in the country"; Rev. E. J. Riggs, of Provincetown, asserts that I am "the high-cockalorum of philosophical Anarchism"; Dr. Maryson declares that I am "an eminent individualist Anarchist," and so on. The simple truth is that I do not fill the requirements of any of these statements. Because I know that two and two make four, it does not follow that I am an eminent mathematician, or a high-cockalorum of mathematics, or one of the most intelligent or one of the ablest mathematicians in the country. Those who read these extravagant statements and are not personally acquainted with me expect of me more than I can give; and this puts me in an embarrassing position. If this sort of thing occurred only occasionally, it would not be so bad, but it is coming so thick and fast lately that it puts me in the position of a poor actor being petted with bouquets by his friends and cabbages and over-ripe eggs by his enemies, until he is overwhelmed and takes to his heels, and, when behind the scenes, wonders whether the demonstration was intended for approbation or the contrary.

For the benefit of those who read my simple contributions to the public journals, let me say that I never had the advantages of even the public schools; that pinching poverty drove me early to work, so that, at the age of thirteen, I was doing a man's work on farm and in forest; that I became a printer's devil at sixteen, and followed some branch of newspaper-making up to about three years ago; and now occupy a very modest clerkship in a public department. In politics I have been successively Democrat, Greenbacker, State Socialist, and Anarchist. Not "philosophical" Anarchist, please; just plain Anarchist. I have not been a great reader. *My* conclusions have been arrived at from reading Herbert Spencer, Tucker, Yarros, Andrews, and a few others, and from my own observations and experiences. The best schooling I had was in printing-office and trade-union. So, you see, nothing here to make one "eminent" or "able," or even what the preacher elegantly terms "high-cockalorum."

***

My last article in Liberty seems to have satisfied both Mr. Tucker and Dr. Maryson. Am I, then, to be the instrument through which the radical reform elements are to be brought together? Be that as it may. The fact, however, that there is still a difference between Mr. Tucker and Dr. Maryson as to the exact meaning of my language leads me to the conclusion that it must be ambiguous. May be I can make my position clearer.

Anarchy means no ruler, no government. That is to say, no one—minority or majority—shall have the right to make me do what I do not want to do, so long as I do not injure him, so long as I do not trespass on his just rights.

For example: We have Anarchy in religion. How so? Because no one has a right to compel me to go to church; to worship God or not worship God; to support the church or not support the church. What another has no right to do I have no right to do. Any one may go to whatever church he likes, providing the members permit him. If no church now established wants him, he may establish a church of his own, from which he may exclude any one he does not want in it. But the exclusion of a non-member from a church is not an invasion of his right. This is what I understand to be Anarchy in religion. You see I am not obliged to determine which is the "true" religion, or whether any of them be true, or whether they are all "false." There was a time when this was not so.

Further: We are reaching close on to Anarchy in dress. True, no man has yet the right to wear skirts, and no woman has the right to wear the ordinary clothes of a man. But we are fast coming to that. Note the bloomers. Otherwise, however, we have Anarchy in dress and in fashions. One may wear whatever kind of cloth he chooses, cut in almost whatever shape he likes, dyed in whatever color that suits his fancy. There was a time when this was not so. But the existence of Anarchy in dress and fashion does not determine which is the most becoming or economical.

Further still: Between the States within the boundaries of the United States we have Anarchy in trade,—in commerce,—in so far as the mere exchange of products is concerned. In other words, we have free trade between the States. Every one who aims to extend this principle of free trade to other countries is in so far an Anarchist. He denies the right of government interfence in trade. But this does not compel him to say which is the best way to trade, or whether two bushels of corn is worth three bushels of potatoes, etc. Each individual trader must determine that for himself.

And still other examples: One in the United States may come and go as he pleases, without let or hindrance, except in those few insignificant localities where prevail the notions of right and wrong only a little removed from the rudest barbarians, and where we find the "modern" tramp laws. This has not always been so. In some countries even to-day one must have a little piece of paper, on which are written words by government authority, to permit one to go from place to place. In the United States we have Anarchy in travel.

The individual workman in this and many other countries may now work for whoever will employ him and take whatever wages he can get. This was not always so. Here, then, is another phase of Anarchy.

***

Anarchy in so many things has proven such a boon to the human race that we who have learned and observed its *effects* think it would be a good thing to extend the principle to other fields of human activity, and, if the benefits increase in proportion as the principle is adopted, we see no reason why it should not in time be applied to everything.

***

I want Anarchy because it will beneficially affect my economic as well as social conditions. The idea of my being subject to some one else's will in my actions in whatever walk of life I may be is irksome to me. The fact that I must ask some fellow-worm for leave to toil, and that he has the power to grant or refuse the request, is galling in the extreme. The slave who fully recognizes his condition feels his disgrace more than one who believes slavery to be his normal condition.

***

There is authority now in the titles to land. Government assumes, as one of its functions, to see that the ownership or use of land will be just and equitable. This is the theory. But what is the practice? I believe the ownership, the occupancy and use, of land could be better determined if the government had nothing to do with it. Hence I want Anarchy as to landholding.

***

Government has for hundreds of years assumed the function of making money. It has never done so to my satisfaction. I believe that, if government will permit us to make our own medium of exchange, we can do so with less expense than is imposed, and greater security than is furnished, by the money issued under government authority and monopoly.

***

I want the principle of Anarchy pushed wherever it can be and as fast as it can be. Under Anarchy I may join with others and form a community where Communism prevails, and no one has the right to prevent me. On the other hand, I may go away by myself and live isolated from my fellows. I may live in a thickly-populated locality without invading the right of others to be either Communists or Individualists. My opinion now is—and it is well verified by facts—that personal reponsibility and private enterprise in business and industry produce the best results.

I deny that the community has rights in equity which do not belong to the individual.

There is no doubt at all in my mind that liberty has a good effect upon economics. Free competition is the soul of progress. JOSEPH A. LABADIE.

Nietzsche on Egoism.

[Translated from the German by George Schumm.]

A good author who really has his cause at heart longs for some one to come and replace him by presenting the same cause more clearly and by more completely answering the questions raised by it. The loving girl longs to prove the devoted fidelity of her love through the infidelity of her lover. The soldier longs to die on the battlefield for his victorious country; for in the victory of his country his highest aspirations are also victorious. The mother gives to her child what she denies to herself,—sleep, the best food, if need be her health, her property. But are all these unegoistic conditions? Are these actions of morality *miracles* because, in Schopenhauer's language, they are "impossible and yet real"? Is it not clear that in all these cases a man loves *some part of himself*, a thought, a desire, a product, more than *some other part of himself*; that he thus *divides* his nature, and sacrifices the one part to the other? Is there anything *essentially* different in the declaration of an obstinate man: "I will rather be shot down than go a step out of the way of this fellow"? There is, in all of the above cases, an *inclination toward something* (wish, impulse, desire); to yield to it, with all the consequences, is certainly not "unegoistic."—*Menschliches Allzumenschliches.*

There is no help: we must mercilessly put on trial and cross-question the sentiments of devotion, of self-sacrifice, the whole morality of unselfishness, as well as the æsthetic of "disinterested contemplation," under which the emasculation of art seeks alluringly enough to create for itself a good conscience to-day. There is too much of moonshine and sugar in those sentiments, in this "for others," in this "*not* for myself," so that there should be no need here of being doubly suspicious and of asking: "Are they perhaps the language of the—seducer?" That they *please*—him who has them, and him who enjoys their fruits, also the mere spectator,—this furnishes no argument *for* them, but invites prudence. Let us be prudent, then!—*Jenseits von Gut und Böse.*

In listening to the now so popular phrase of the "disinterested," one must consider, perhaps not without some danger, in *what* the people really take an interest, and what are, in general, the things about which the common man concerns himself thoroughly and profoundly,—including the educated, even the *savants*, and, unless all signs mislead, almost also the philosophers. Thereby the fact is brought out that

most of what interests and fascinates every superior nature appears to the average man as entirely "uninteresting": if he, nevertheless, observes a devotion to it, he calls it "*désintéressé*," and wonders how it is possible to act "disinterestedly." There have been philosophers who knew how to invest this popular wonderment with an alluring and mystically otherworldly aspect (perhaps because they did not know the superior nature from experience?), instead of setting forth the plain and naked truth that the disinterested action is a *very* interesting and interested action, provided. . . . "And love?" What! even love you would make out to be "unegoistic"? Dunces! "And the praise of the self-sacrificing?" But whoso has really made sacrifices knows that he wanted and got something for them—perhaps something from himself—that he gave here in order to have more there, perhaps in order generally to be more, or at any rate to feel himself as "more." But this is a realm of questions and answers in which a pampered spirit does not like to tarry: so necessary is it here already for truth, if she must answer, to suppress yawning. And she is a woman: one must not do violence to her.
—*Jenseits von Gut und Böse.*

"SCIENCE" AS PREJUDICE.—It follows from the laws of the order of rank (*Rangordnung*) that *savants*, in so far as they belong to the intellectual middle class, do not even see the truly *great* problems and question-marks: besides, their courage, and likewise their vision, do not reach so far,—above all, the need which makes of them investigators, their inner wish and anticipation that things might be ordered *so* and *so*, their fears and hopes, are too soon satisfied and set at rest. That, for instance, which makes the pedantical Englishman, Herbert Spencer, dream after his fashion, and causes him to draw a line of hope, a horizon-line of desirability, the final reconciliation of "egoism and altruism," of which he fables, gives to persons of our kind almost a feeling of nausea; a humanity with such Spencerian perspectives as final perspectives would seem to us as worthy of contempt, of destruction! But already *that* something must be experienced by him as a highest hope which is, and rightly may be, to others, only a repulsive possibility, is a question-mark which Spencer could not have foreseen.—*Fröhliche Wissenschaft.*

Wind-Harp Songs.

Poems of life, love, nature, liberty, and death. An appropriate gift-book. Nicely bound.

Price, $1.00.

Mailed, post-paid, by the author,
J. WM. LLOYD, WESTFIELD, NEW JERSEY.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY.

BY

STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS.

A well-printed book of 165 large pages, consisting of two essays bearing the following titles respectively: "The True Constitution of Government in the Sovereignty of the Individual as the Final Development of Protestantism, Democracy, and Socialism"; "Cost the Limit of Price: A Scientific Measure of Honesty in Trade as One of the Fundamental Principles in the Solution of the Social Problem." This work is an elaborate exposition of the teachings of Josiah Warren by one of his foremost disciples.

PRICE IN CLOTH, $1.00; IN PAPER, 50 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

MODERN MARRIAGE.

BY ÉMILE ZOLA.

Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.

In this his latest story Zola takes four typical marriages,—one from the nobility, one from the *bourgeoisie*, one from the petty *bourgeoisie*, and one from the working-people,—and describes, with all the power of his wondrous art, how each originates, by what motive each is inspired, how each is consummated, and how each results.

PRICE, 15 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, NEW YORK CITY.

RIPANS TABULES regulate the stomach, liver and bowels, purify the blood, are safe and effectual. The best general family medicine known for Biliousness, Constipation, Dyspepsia, Foul Breath, Headache, Heartburn, Loss of Appetite, Mental Depression, Painful Digestion, Pimples, Sallow Complexion, Tired Feeling, and every symptom or disease resulting from impure blood, or a failure by the stomach, liver or intestines to perform their proper functions. Persons given to over eating are benefited by taking a TABULE after each meal. Price, of druggists or by mail, Box (6 vials) 60c. Package (4 boxes) $2.00. Address THE RIPANS CHEMICAL CO., New York. Samples free.

MUTUAL BANKING.

BY

WILLIAM B. GREENE.

Showing the radical deficiency of the existing circulating medium and the advantages of a free currency; a plan whereby to abolish interest, not by State intervention, but by first abolishing State intervention itself.

One of the most important works on finance in the English language.

New and Cheap Edition.

PRICE, TEN CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

INSTEAD OF A BOOK:

BY A MAN TOO BUSY TO WRITE ONE.

A FRAGMENTARY EXPOSITION OF

PHILOSOPHICAL ANARCHISM.

Culled from the Writings of
BENJ. R. TUCKER,
EDITOR OF LIBERTY.

With a Full-Page Half-Tone Portrait of the Author.

A large, well-printed, and excessively cheap volume of 534 pages, consisting of articles selected from Liberty and classified under the following headings: (1) State Socialism and Anarchism: How Far They Agree, and Wherein They Differ; (2) The Individual, Society, and the State; (3) Money and Interest; (4) Land and Rent; (5) Socialism; (6) Communism; (7) Methods; (8) Miscellaneous. The whole elaborately indexed.

Price, Fifty Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, NEW YORK CITY.

SLAVES TO DUTY.

By John Badcock, Jr.

A unique addition to the pamphlet literature of Anarchism, in that it assails the morality superstition as the foundation of the various schemes for the exploitation of mankind. Max Stirner himself does not expound the doctrine of Egoism in bolder fashion. 30 pages.

PRICE, 15 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

THE BALLOT.

BY WILLIAM WALSTEIN GORDAK.

A short poem illustrating the absurdity of majority rule. Printed as a leaflet, with an effective advertisement of Liberty on the back. Excellent for propagandism.

Ten Cents Per Hundred Copies.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER Box 1312, New York City.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

SO THE RAILWAY KINGS ITCH FOR AN EMpire, Do They? By a "Red-Hot Striker," of Scranton, Pa. A reply to an article by William M. Grosvenor in the *International Review*. Price, 10 cents; per hundred, $4.00.

BOMBS: The Poetry and Philosophy of Anarchy. By William A. Whittick. 197 pages. Price, cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents.

ANARCHISTS' MARCH. Tune: Björneborgarnes Marsch (Finnish War Song). Words by J. Wm. Lloyd. Price, 10 cents.

CAPTAIN ROLAND'S PURSE: How It is Filled and How Emptied. By John Ruskin. The first of a projected series of Labor Tracts. Supplied at 37 cents per hundred.

THE STORY OF AN AFRICAN FARM. By Olive Schreiner. A romance, not of adventure, but of the intellectual life and growth of young English and German people living among the Boers and Kaffirs; picturing the mental struggles through which they passed in their evolution from orthodoxy to rationalism; and representing advanced ideas on religious and social questions. A work of remarkable power, beauty, and originality. 375 pages. Price, cloth, 60 cents; paper, 25 cents.

WORK AND WEALTH. By J. K. Ingalls. 31 pages. Price, 10 cents.

THE WIND AND THE WHIRLWIND. By Wilfred Scawen Blunt. A poem worthy of a place in every man's library, and especially interesting to all victims of British tyranny and misrule. A red-line edition, printed beautifully, in large type, on fine paper, and bound in parchment covers. Elegant and cheap. 32 pages. Price, 25 cents.

HEROES OF THE REVOLUTION OF '71. A souvenir picture of the Paris Commune, presenting Fifty-One Portraits of the men whose names are most prominently connected with that great uprising of the people, and adorned with mottoes from Danton, Blanqui, Pyat, Proudhon, J. Wm. Lloyd, Tridon, and August Spies. Of all the Commune souvenirs that have ever been issued this picture stands easily first. It is executed by the phototype process from a very rare collection of photographs, measures 15 inches by 24, and is printed on heavy paper for framing. Over 50 portraits for 25 cents.

A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. A serious denunciation of State and Governments, under whatever name or form they may exist. By the famous statesman, Edmund Burke. 36 pages. Price, 10 cents.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

ANARCHISM: ITS AIMS AND METHODS. An address delivered at the first public meeting of the Boston Anarchists' Club, and adopted by that organization as its authorized exposition of its principles. With an appendix giving the Constitution of the Anarchists' Club and explanatory notes regarding it. By Victor Yarros. 30 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 25 copies, $1.00; 100 copies, $3.00.

GOD AND THE STATE. "One of the most eloquent pleas for liberty ever written. Paine's 'Age of Reason' and 'Rights of Man' consolidated and improved. It stirs the pulse like a trumpet call." By Michael Bakounine. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. 52 pages. Price, 15 cents.

MUTUAL BANKING: Showing the radical deficiency of the existing circulating medium, and how interest on money can be abolished. By William B. Greene. Price, 25 cents.

FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: Their Nature, Essence, and Maintenance. An abridgment and rearrangement of Lysander Spooner's "Trial by Jury." Edited by Victor Yarros. 47 pages. Price, 25 cents.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? Or, an Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government. By P. J. Proudhon. Prefaced by a Sketch of Proudhon's Life and Works. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. A systematic, thorough, and radical discussion of the institution of property,—its basis, its history, its present status, and its destiny,—together with a detailed and startling *exposé* of the crimes which it commits, and the evils which it engenders. 500 pages octavo. Price, cloth, $2.00; paper, $1.20.

SYSTEM OF ECONOMICAL CONTRADICTIONS; Or, the Philosophy of Misery. By P. J. Proudhon. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. This work constitutes the fourth volume of the Complete Works, and is published in a style uniform with that of "What Is Property?" It discusses, in a style as novel as profound, the problems of Value, Division of Labor, Machinery, Competition, Monopoly, Taxation, and Providence, showing that economic progress is achieved by the appearance of a succession of economic forces, each of which counteracts the evils developed by its predecessor, and then, by developing evils of its own, necessitates its successor, the process to continue until a final force, corrective of the whole, shall establish a stable economic equilibrium. 469 pages octavo, in the highest style of the typographic art. Price, cloth, $2.00.

A POLITICIAN IN SIGHT OF HAVEN: Being a Protest Against Government of Man by Man. By Auberon Herbert. Price, 10 cents.

INVOLUNTARY IDLENESS. An exposition of the causes of the discrepancy existing between the supply of and the demand for labor and its products. By Hugo Bilgram. 119 pages. Price, cloth, 50 cents.

A LETTER TO GROVER CLEVELAND ON HIS False Inaugural Address, the Usurpations and Crimes of Lawmakers and Judges, and the Consequent Poverty, Ignorance, and Servitude of the People. 1886. By Lysander Spooner. 110 pages. Price, 35 cents.

THE ANARCHISTS: A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century. A poet's prose contribution to the literature of philosophic and egoistic Anarchism. The author traces his own mental development in London amid the exciting events of 1887,—the manifestations of the unemployed, the rioting at Trafalgar Square, and the executions at Chicago. The antagonism between Communism and Anarchism sharply brought out. By John Henry Mackay. Translated from the German by George Schumm. 315 pages, with portrait of the author. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

TAXATION OR FREE TRADE? A Criticism upon Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade?" By John F. Kelly. 16 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 100 copies, $3.00.

SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC, MUTUALISTIC, and Financial Fragments. By W. B. Greene. Price, $1.25.

CO-OPERATION: ITS LAWS AND PRINCIPLES. An essay showing Liberty and Equity as the only conditions of true co-operation, and exposing the violations of these conditions by Rent, Interest, Profit, and Majority Rule. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Herbert Spencer. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

PROHIBITION. An essay on the relation of government to temperance, showing that prohibition cannot prohibit, and would be unnecessary if it could. By C. T. Fowler. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE REORGANIZATION OF BUSINESS. An essay showing how the principles of co-operation may be realized in the Store, the Bank, and the Factory. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CORPORATIONS. An essay showing how the monopoly of railroads, telegraphs, etc., may be abolished without the intervention of the State. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Wendell Phillips. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CO-OPERATIVE HOMES. An essay showing how the kitchen may be abolished and the independence of woman secured by severing the State from the Home, thereby introducing the voluntary principle into the Family and all its relationships. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Louise Michel. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

LAND TENURE. An essay showing the governmental basis of land monopoly, the futility of governmental remedies, and a natural and peaceful way of starving out the landlords. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Robert Owen. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LAWS of Congress Prohibiting Private Mails. 1844. By Lysander Spooner. 24 pages. Price, 10 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. II. 1867. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 15 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. VI. Showing that the constitution is of no authority. 1870. By Lysander Spooner. 50 pages. Price, 25 cents.

ILLEGALITY OF THE TRIAL OF JOHN W. WEBster. Containing the substance of the author's larger work, "Trial by Jury," now out of print. 1850. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 10 cents

NATURAL LAW: Or, the Science of Justice. A treatise on natural law, natural justice, natural rights, natural liberty, and natural society; showing that all legislation whatsoever is an absurdity, a usurpation, and a crime. Part First, 1882. By Lysander Spooner. 31 pages. Price, 10 cents.

A LETTER TO THOMAS F. BAYARD. Challenging his right—and that of all the other so-called senators and representatives in Congress—to exercise any legislative power whatever over the people of the United States. By Lysander Spooner. Price, 3 cents.